

---

# **COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PLAN**

## **Eureka Mills Site**

## **Eureka, Utah**

## **October 2001**



**U. S. Environmental  
Protection Agency  
Region VIII**

**Utah Department of  
Environmental Quality**

---

## Table of Contents

---

Overview of the Community Involvement Plan . . . . .	4
Site Description . . . . .	5
Geography . . . . .	5
History . . . . .	5
Investigation . . . . .	7
Blood Lead Testing . . . . .	7
Soil Sampling . . . . .	7
Risk Assessment . . . . .	8
Community Outreach . . . . .	9
Community Profile . . . . .	10
Population and Growth . . . . .	10
Employment and Education . . . . .	11
Population Characteristics . . . . .	11
Land Use . . . . .	12
Community Concerns . . . . .	13
Activities, Objectives, and Timing . . . . .	17
Attachment A–Contacts . . . . .	20
Attachment B–Repository and List of Documents . . . . .	24
Attachment C–Community Interview Questionnaire . . . . .	25
Figure 1 Site Location . . . . .	5
Figure 2 Residential Areas, Commercial Areas and Nearby Mining Areas . . . . .	8

## Overview of the Community Involvement Plan\_\_\_\_\_

The purpose of the Superfund Community Involvement Program (CIP) is to ensure two way communication between citizens and the regulatory agencies. The activities described in the CIP for the Eureka Mills site located in Eureka, Utah are designed to inform and educate the public about the nature of the environmental issues at the site. We strive to involve the public in the decision-making process. This includes the cleanup alternatives under consideration to address the contamination and the progress being made to implement the remedy.

The federal and state agencies that have primary responsibility for the Eureka Mills site are EPA and the Utah Department of Environmental Quality (UDEQ). Other related government agencies include the Utah Department of Health (UDOH) and the Central Utah Public Health Department. The work being conducted is under the authority of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA Public Law 96-510) commonly referred to as Superfund. This law addresses actual or threatened releases of hazardous substances or contaminants and whether cleanup is necessary. The investigation and any cleanup actions taken must be based on guidance contained in the National Contingency Plan.

The development of the CIP is further guided by the EPA “Community Relations in Superfund: A Handbook” dated January 1992. The CIP must be periodically updated to ensure that government officials maintain an awareness of the issues and concerns of the community. EPA and UDEQ conducted interviews with sixteen members of the Eureka community representing a broad range of private citizens, local government officials, businesses and community groups. Additionally, the CIP is based on comments received at two public meetings held in Eureka. The CIP will be implemented by EPA and the UDEQ.

The CIP is tailored to the specific needs and concerns of the residents of Eureka and identifies the most effective ways to keep the public informed of the work taking place in the area. Active public involvement is crucial to the success of the work being conducted at the site. The major elements of the plan are as follows:

- ▶ A description of the lead and arsenic contamination in residential soil and mining areas.
- ▶ A geographic, social and economic background about the community.
- ▶ A summary of the concerns identified during interviews with residents.
- ▶ Our plan for keeping the community aware and involved.

## Site Description

---

### Geography

The town of Eureka, Juab County is located in central Utah and can be reached by traveling south from Salt Lake City to Santaquin on I-15 and then west on Hwy 6, a total distance of approximately 84 miles (see Figure 1). The town is situated in a small valley at the head of the drainage basin for Eureka Creek, an ephemeral stream which flows into the Tanner Creek in the Tintic valley. Several historic floods have occurred as a result of torrential rains flowing along Main St. or Eureka Gulch. The area is classified as a middle latitude continental desert and steppe climate with cold winters and hot summers. The average maximum temperature is 59.2 F and the minimum is 33.7 F. Annual rainfall is 17.02 inches and snowfall is 121.2 inches per year. Soils are light gray to grayish brown abundant with calcium carbonate. Vegetation in the area is dominated by low shrubs, sagebrush and grasses, pinyon-juniper and cedar woodland.

Located in the East Tintic Mountains, Eureka Peak has an elevation of 7,916 ft above sea level and the elevation of the town ranges from 6,350 to 6,580 feet at the eastern summit divide. The East Tintic mountains are composed of Paleozoic sedimentary rocks and Tertiary igneous rocks. The ores consist of native silver, gold with sulfides and carbonates of lead, copper, iron, zinc, cadmium, and bismuth.

### History

The area in and around Eureka is known as the Tintic Mining District and includes other areas of mining activity to the south and east. The name Tintic comes from the Ute tribe whose Chief was named Tintic. In 1856, war erupted between the tribe and local cattlemen resulting in a victory for the settlers in the area. Over 10 years later in 1869, the Tintic mining district was organized with the discovery of ore in the Sunbeam claim registered by a group of Mormon cowboys. A year later, in February of 1870 the first mining claim in Eureka called Eureka Hill would be discovered by settlers looking for firewood.

The Eureka Hill claim was soon followed by the Bullion Beck, the Gemini, and Centennial Eureka mines. Pitching tents in the Eureka Gulch, early settlers from Ireland, Wales and Germany had the spirit and mining skills brought from overseas to bring the precious metals from below the ground. The time period from 1869 to 1890, called the "Rainbow Era", were the formative years of mining development. It was made possible not only by the completion of the transcontinental railroad in 1869 but primarily by the resiliency and optimism of the miners themselves.

Beginning in 1890 two significant developments assured Eureka's place in history as a population center for the Tintic mining district. A railroad spur was built and acquisition of a water supply complete with a pump and pipeline enabled Eureka to grow and prosper. The town

incorporated in 1892 and by 1899 had a population of 3500 residents who required the support of the ninety plus commercial and business enterprises located in the town. Chief Consolidated Mining Co. made its appearance in 1909. Walter Fitch, owner of shares in the Little Chief Mining Co., organized the Eureka City Mining Co. and later consolidated the two companies with the intent to mine under the Eureka town. Owners of an acre of ground would receive 1000 shares of stock for mineral rights to the property. By 1922, Chief had become the largest producer of silver in the United States.

Eureka, like many of the other mining regions, suffered from the boom and bust cycles inherent in the mining economy due to the rise and fall of prices for silver and gold. As mining of high grade gold, silver, lead and zinc continued, a number of economic factors, especially high transportation costs, made the development of mills a necessity to process lower grade ore. Although there were many attempts to mill the ore in Eureka, both lower transportation costs and the difficulty in extracting minerals from more complex ores made milling uneconomic.

Throughout the early 1900s up until 1933 the production of ore from the Tintic mining district increased with a peak value in 1925 of \$16,187,583. The low was reached during the depression years of only \$1,881,637 in 1933. The combination of unstable mineral prices, the influence of depression and the impact of WW II in the country as a whole led to the economic decline of Eureka. The approximate production of precious metals from the Tintic district was 16,654,377 tons in 1976, which was estimated to be worth \$568,620,003. Overall, this district was equal in production of ore to the Park City District and second in the state to Bingham County. The Tintic mining district produced 2,648,000 ounces of gold which is greater than the Mother Lode district of Calaveras County in California.

The town of Eureka was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in March 1979. Today, there are numerous examples of a once prosperous mining district such as old mining structures, massive wood headframes, and the ruins of mills and buildings. The community is very proud about its mining history and wish to preserve the artifacts and legends of the past.

## Investigation

---

The historical mining activities in the area left mine waste piles adjacent to residences and businesses in Eureka. The exposed rock piles left over from mining began to naturally degrade from wind and rain erosion which slowly distributed lead and arsenic to the valley below the mining areas. Human actions such as the transport of the ore to the railway and the use of mine waste as fill material also contributed to the distribution of mine and mill waste through the town. Historical flooding also contributed, for instance, in 1900 the tailing ponds at the Eureka Hill Mill broke and flooded Eureka Gulch with mill waste. The major mines in the area are the Eureka Hill Mine, Bullion Beck Mine, Gemini Mine, Centennial Eureka Mine, Chief No. 1 Mine and the Eagle-Bluebell Mine. There are four significant mill sites as follows: Bullion Beck, Champion Mill, Chief Consolidated Mills and the Eureka Hill Mill ( see Figure 2).

### Blood Lead Testing

In July of 2000, the Central Utah Health Department conducted limited blood lead sampling of 18 children in the community. The results of that sampling indicated high levels of blood lead in excess of the 10 µg/dl the Center for Disease Control health standard. The high levels of blood lead triggered further investigation by UDOH in the fall of 2000. This effort combined both blood lead sampling and a survey on patterns of behavior which may impact lead exposures. Approximately, 238 children and adults were tested. Of these, 28 children and two adults showed elevated blood lead levels. Of the children tested between the ages 6-72 months, 13 had blood lead levels above the standard and between the ages of 6 - 18 years, 15 children had levels above the standard.

### Soil Sampling

In July of 2000, the UDEQ conducted an initial investigation and collected 49 soil and sediment samples, of these EPA took 36 splits, from the Eureka area. These samples were collected from residential yards, mining waste piles and sediments in drainage ditches. The analyses showed the presence of lead from a few hundred to 30,000 parts per million (ppm) and arsenic from 15 to 2200 ppm. Approximately 150 acres of lead and arsenic contaminated soil has been identified to date.

The results of both the initial soil sampling and the blood lead testing prompted EPA to initiate further site assessment activities. Access agreements were obtained from property owners for 504 residential lots and sampling began in August of 2000. Each lot was divided into one or more zones of 15,000 square ft. and five soil samples were collected from each zone. The samples were analyzed to determine the concentration of 24 different elements. As of December of 2000 over 4200 samples had been collected. These efforts showed that most of the soil found in residential lots in Eureka is contaminated with lead at levels greater than 500 ppm and, to a lesser extent, arsenic. At least 430 properties contain lead at levels of concern. At the same time,

indoor sampling was also begun in 57 homes for dust and lead-based paint.

Drinking water and wells were also tested. The results of the indoor sampling were inconclusive about whether lead exposure was from inside or outside the home. The drinking water is not contaminated with lead but some earthen basements had high levels of lead and some homes had concentrations of lead in paint over the standard of 1.0 mg/cm.

EPA also sampled for the same range of metals in the mining areas. The Agency collected 326 soil samples at the surface level and at depths up to 18 inches. Concentrations of lead in the mine dumps and adjacent areas were fairly high- ranging from 2000 ppm to more than 28,000 ppm. Samples were also taken from areas that were not affected by mining activities in order to determine the background levels of metals that are naturally occurring. Background concentrations for lead in the Eureka area ranged from less than 100 ppm to a little more than 300 ppm.

## Risk Assessment

In reviewing the data collected to date, EPA and UDEQ have concluded that the lead and arsenic are contaminants of concern that pose a significant potential risk of exposure to the community. The lead occurs in a carbonate form. Laboratory tests found the lead to be 60% to 90% bio-accessible meaning that it would be readily absorbed in the bloodstream. The potential threat is from the inhalation of airborne lead particles and ingestion of soil especially for children who have the highest risk from adverse health impacts. Children are most susceptible to the toxic effects of lead for several reasons:

- ▶ Developing organs are more sensitive to lead.
- ▶ Behavioral patterns increase contact with dust and soil.
- ▶ Children absorb lead from the gastrointestinal tract more efficiently than adults.

## EPA Removal Actions

EPA has initiated an emergency removal of lead-contaminated soil in residential areas. The removal efforts began in July of 2001 with the identification of the most seriously contaminated lots. Several factors were used to prioritize lots: 1) residences with lead greater than 3000 ppm; 2) residences with children whose blood lead levels are greater than 10 µg/dl; or 3) residences adjacent to lots with high levels of lead and are at or near 3000 ppm (included to prevent recontamination). Clean topsoil will replace soil removed down to one foot, and if removal is to a deeper level, a clay mixture will be used. All residences will have as close to original landscaping materials as possible. EPA anticipates the removal action of contaminated soil to continue into the 2002 construction season.



## Community Outreach

The Eureka community was made aware of the work that EPA and UDEQ have been doing over the past year. An initial public meeting held in August of 2000 presented the results of the soil sampling and lead testing efforts. This was followed by a community-wide lead testing and public education effort in September, 2000. Additionally, a second public meeting held in March of 2001 provided the results of sampling for lead and arsenic on residential lots and explained the process for cleaning up properties. During May of this year another lead education for primary and secondary school children was undertaken by the UDOH. In June of 2001, EPA formally proposed listing the Eureka Mills site to the National Priorities List.

Overall the community has been both concerned and surprised about the situation. There are some in the community who do not believe that exposure to lead is a problem for human health. Many of the residents have lived in the area for their entire lives and do not think they have been affected by lead contamination. For the most part, residents first heard about the EPA and UDEQ investigation of lead contamination through the newspaper. EPA's legal requirement to publish a notice in the newspaper advertising the first public meeting triggered interest by the press. At that time and subsequently, residents feel the press have portrayed the town of Eureka in a negative way despite requests to present a more balance and accurate description of the situation. This has been of great concern to the community who are anxious about the way their town is viewed by outsiders.

In contrast, there are many residents who have children, grandchildren or nieces/nephews and want EPA and the state to quickly remove the lead contaminated soil because of the fear of impacts to human health. These residents do support the work that is being undertaken and are mostly concerned that EPA will not have enough funding to finish the work. Overall, those who support the cleanup work want their viewpoints to be heard and respected especially on the details of residential yard cleanup.

## Community Profile

---

Juab County covers 3,412 square miles. The city of Eureka is located in the extreme northeast portion of Juab County in the East Tintic Mountains. The county line between Juab and Utah is at the eastern incorporated limit of Eureka. The City of Provo is the county seat for Utah. Nephi (population 4,000) is the Juab county seat and is located 41 miles from Eureka. Other communities near Eureka include Mona and Santaquin. The major population and industrial centers near Eureka include Provo, pop. 102,327 (40 miles northeast) and Salt Lake City, pop. 174,438 (84 miles north).

### Population and Growth

In the past decade, Juab County has experienced significant growth. In 2000, the U.S. Bureau of the Census estimated the county population to be 8,238, a 41.6% increase from 1990. The city of Eureka experienced a 36 % change in population during the same time period, with a 2000 population estimate of 766 residents. Because Juab County is in close proximity to the Wasatch Front Metropolitan areas, increased population growth is anticipated over the next 20 years, as demand for additional residential land increases. The Utah Governor's Office of Planning and Budget has projected a total increase in Juab County population by approximately 80%. The population of Eureka is expected to increase by approximately 27%, or 204 people.

POPULATION DISTRIBUTION BY AGE		
Age Category	Juab County	Eureka
Under age 5	11.2%	9.1%
5-19	30.5%	27.0%
20-44	31.5%	33.8%
45-64	16.9%	18.7%
65 & over	9.8%	11.2%

*Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000*

The overall age distribution of residents within Eureka is similar to that of Juab County, while exhibiting a slightly smaller ratio of young residents and slightly higher ratio of elderly. The percent of Eureka's population under the age of 5 equates to 70 children.

## Employment and Education

The most recent census data on education (1990) indicates that within Juab County, 43.1% of the population have at least a high school education, while 4.8% have a bachelor's degree or higher. Juab County's public school system consists of five elementary schools, one middle school and three high schools, with a total enrollment of 2,069. Of these schools, two are located in the city of Eureka, providing a total enrollment of 244.

According to the Juab County Community Economic Development Agency, the majority of the labor force (71%) are employed in non-agricultural activities such as trade, government and service industries. While agriculture and tourism are still important facets of the local economy, the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget lists the Juab County School District as the county's largest employer (200-300), along with Central Valley Medical Center (100-200) and Nephi Rubber Products (100-200). Other significant government and private sector employers include Juab County, the city of Nephi, medical service institutions and manufacturing companies. The per capita income for Juab County as of 1998 was \$14,883 and the employment rate was approximately 95%.

Data collected by the Utah Department of Workforce Services indicates that as of 1999, there were a total of 21 nonagricultural firms in Eureka, employing a total of 178 people. A listing of current business permits issued by the City of Eureka indicate 18 active permits as of 2001. These businesses are a mixture of small retail service, restaurants and small industry.

## Population Characteristics

Population characteristics such as ethnicity, size of household and length of residence can be helpful in describing the nature of a community. The data obtained through the U.S Census Bureau for Eureka and Juab County reflects the stability of the community.

Approximately 97.6% of Eureka's population is Caucasian, 2.3 % (18 people) are of Hispanic origin and the remainder are American Indian, Asian or other origins. This overall distribution is consistent with the remainder of Juab County.

Information obtained from the Juab County Citizens Survey conducted in 1994 indicated that 80 % percent of the families in Eureka are composed of 4 or less members (49% have two or less members). The larger percentage of one to two member families may be attributed to a higher proportion of older, retired persons. This is reflected in countywide statistics as well, with 36% of Juab County families containing two or less members.

The Citizens Survey also showed that 69% of Eureka's population has resided there for over 20 years, reflecting a great amount of stability within the community. Approximately 17% of

the residents have been there 5 years or less, with the remainder having lived in the town between 6 and 20 years. Countywide, 54% of the population has resided in Juab County for 20 years or more, while 24% have relocated to the county within the past 5 years.

## Land Use

The Federal Government controls 71.9% (1,569,966 acres) of the land area in Juab County. Federal agencies which manage the land include the Bureau of Land Management (90%), Forest Service (7.0%) and the Fish & Wildlife Department (1.0%). Private ownership of 382,144 acres constitutes 17.5% of total land area, while the State of Utah owns 178,526 acres or 8.18% of the total. The remainder of county land belongs to incorporated cities, the Goshute Reservation, roads and railroad right-of-ways. The city of Eureka owns 550 acres (or 0.03%) of county land.

Historically, agriculture has been the predominant land use for eastern Juab County. Range and crop lands are still viable land uses within the county. Presently, the major land use in Mona and Levan is agricultural. Nephi is the most urbanized area within Juab County, thus the main land use is residential in nature. The main land uses identified for Eureka are mining claims, vacant lands and streets.

## Community Concerns

---

The community interviews for this plan were conducted in July of 2001. Interviewees responses to the questions have been summarized into four main areas as follows:

- 1) Awareness of the lead contaminated soil.
- 2) Concern about the work EPA and UDEQ plan to do.
- 3) Issues the community would like the EPA/UDEQ to address.
- 4) How to provide for effective communication with the public.

### 1) Awareness of the lead contaminated soil

The majority of the interviewees were made aware of the soil contamination through the local newspapers and TV stations prior to the public meeting held by EPA/UDEQ. The time period was about August of 2000. A few interviewees were aware of the work that was being done by UDEQ earlier in the summer when the PA/SI was being conducted. Staff from EPA advised the Mayor of the preliminary soil sampling results in late July. Additionally, several property owners were aware of the soil sampling because of the need to obtain permission to do the sampling. Some of the interviewees were aware of the concern about high blood lead levels as a result of testing that had been conducted in July of 2000 by the Central Utah Health Department. A very few interviewees first became aware of the lead issue at the EPA/UDEQ public meeting held in August of 2000.

Attendance at the first public meeting was very high as the community was greatly alarmed by the information provided by the media. The media reports focused on the high blood lead levels found in a few children from the Eureka area and concluded that EPA planned to announce Eureka as a Superfund site. None of the media reports included specific information quantifying the results of the soil sampling or blood lead testing since that information was only provided at the public meeting. Consequently, the media reported generally about the situation and in a way that was viewed by the community as being negative, exploitive and especially upsetting for parents with children.

Awareness of the situation is predominately about high levels of lead in children's blood attributed to lead in the soil as a result of mining activity. Some of the interviewees are undecided about whether lead is causing a problem for children in the area. They are uncertain whether the lead is coming from the mining area or from other sources. Some of the other sources mentioned were 1) contaminated soil from areas outside of Eureka; 2) new residents to the area whose children had high blood lead before moving to Eureka ; and 3) parents whose habits or occupations have resulted in lead exposure. Three of the interviewees believe there is not a lead problem in the area and that the only "problem" is the presence of EPA/UDEQ.

### 2) Concern about the work that EPA/UDEQ plan to do

There were many similarities in the kinds of concerns that the interviewees have about the work being conducted by EPA/UDEQ. The concerns ranged from very broad to narrow and from one interviewee who felt that the work was a “government make work project” to another who said “to not play politics and get on with the cleanup”. Those interviewees with children were the most concerned about the cleanup of yards and the mining areas as expressed by one interviewee “the cleanup might be bad for business but to not cleanup is bad for children and kids are more important”. Only one parent interviewed didn’t believe there is a problem and won’t have their children tested for lead. The main highlights of the concerns are listed in order of those most frequently mentioned by the interviewees.

The three top concerns were the repository site location for disposing of the contaminated dirt; real estate values; and the plans for cleaning up residential yards. Each of these concerns had specific attributes many of which were repeated by the interviewees and are highlighted below:

### **Repository Site**

The main concern was the proposed use of the Chief No. 1 mine site as a repository, specifically the proximity of the site to residences and the potential for recontamination. Related issues had to do with leaving the dirt in town; the manner of disposing of the dirt such as precautions to prevent flooding/runoff, spilling and dust control; and the potential of moving the dirt twice if the Chief site was not selected as a final repository. Only one interviewee fully supported the use of the Chief No. 1 site.

### **Real Estate Values**

There were a few interviewees who were not concerned about real estate values and felt that the cleanup of the yards was a higher priority than whether someone’s property could be sold. This group also felt that the cleanup would improve their property value. Several were very anxious about the possibility of having difficulty based on rumors about real estate problems. However, at least two interviewees had recently encountered difficulty in actual real estate transactions based in part on the lead in the soil rather than being labeled a Superfund site.

### **Residential Yard Cleanup**

The quality of soil being used to replace soil removed and fears about losing mature landscaping were the major issues about the yard cleanup. Most of the interviewees wanted more information about how we decided which properties to clean up first, in what order and what to expect. A few were afraid of future restrictions being placed on their property or of being held up on landscaping plans. Others were worried about the delay in cleaning up their property because of exposure to their own children or visiting relatives and/or friends children.

Some interviewees had very site specific concerns that were not shared by others such as concerns about damage to structures like foundations and walls from construction equipment. A few wanted to know if trails used by kids for bicycling or motorbiking would be removed and whether old mining holes could be filled with dirt removed from yards. Another concern was whether there would be any consequences if the property owner decided not to have lead-contaminated soil removed. Of those interviewed, the majority were faced with the probability of a soil removal and were basically supportive if assured that the final decision would be theirs to

make.

Many singular concerns were raised that were not mentioned by other interviewees. Since these concerns cannot be generalized a simple listing of those concerns follows:

- ▶ Doubt about whether the lead found in Eureka can be absorbed by people. Insufficient investigation into naturally occurring lead vs. mining waste lead.
- ▶ Reports that Superfund is underfunded or that EPA/UDEQ will run out of money and not finish the work.
- ▶ EPA not keeping people informed and lying in reports.
- ▶ No followup on blood lead testing of the community.
- ▶ Government is blaming the mining companies.
- ▶ Putting Eureka back 40 years because of bad press.
- ▶ So few jobs for residents in the cleanup effort.
- ▶ No concerns, it needs to be cleaned up.
- ▶ It's a serious health concern and know of friends and neighbors who have kids with ADS (attention deficit syndrome) and adults who have serious health problems like cancer.
- ▶ Want the soil removed in the best possible way because of impact to children.
- ▶ No health problems for generations.

### 3) Issues the community would like EPA/UDEQ to address

The responses from interviewees in this area overlapped somewhat with the previous section on concerns. The main issues that interviewees want the government to be aware of were again a mixture of both general and specific points broadly ranging from supportive to non-supportive of the work. Only three of the interviewees had no issues about the work that EPA/UDEQ is doing but one person mentioned that other unspecified "issues" needed to be taken care of in Eureka.

One issue that particularly stood out as being of importance to many of the interviewees concerned water quality and quantity. Water issues are crucial to the community's long term ability to grow and prosper. Specifically, interviewees would like EPA/UDEQ to dispel any doubts about the quality of drinking water and feel that the media played a role in misinforming the general public. A question arose on whether the removal of soil or drilling of deep wells would have an impact on the watershed as a whole. Drinking water is considered crucial to the viability of Eureka to attract not only tourists but new residents and businesses as well.

Many other issues were raised concerning the loss of historic buildings and measures that would be taken to ensure that the historic character of Eureka be preserved. Additionally, a few interviewees wanted something to be done about providing a place free of lead contaminated soil for kids to ride bicycles including a track or park for motorcycle sports. Some interviewees mentioned inaccurate zoning for the Eureka flood plain resulting in high cost of flood insurance and the recent increase in property taxes as issues that need to be addressed. Once again many issues were raised but not repeated by other interviewees such as: sampling property that has no

occupants; comparisons both good and bad to the residential yard cleanup in Stockton; and status of efforts to identify sources and types of lead.

#### 4) How to provide for effective communication

The majority of the interviewees stated that the information contained in the fact sheets had been very useful and would be a good way to continue communicating with the public. A few others gave detailed comments about the need to be more clear, accurate, specific and to have more information in writing. There was a very broad range of comments both on the frequency and the best way to get information to the public other than direct mail of fact sheets.

In terms of frequency the majority seemed to feel that “as needed” was the best approach. Some would like information quarterly, some monthly and with an emphasis on progress reports on the cleanup. One interviewee stated that quarterly big picture fact sheets with monthly Q&A updates would be useful. Nearly all interviewees stated that the media should not be used for delivering information to the public. The interviewees generally thought that the public meetings had also been useful. Many good ideas about public notices were mentioned such as posting information not only in the post office and City Hall but at the local Texaco station, V&J Grocery, and Linda’s Summit Café.



## Activities, Objectives, and Timing

The overall goal of EPA/UDEQ's community involvement program is to promote two-way communication between citizens and the federal and state agencies. Additionally, it is intended to provide opportunities for meaningful and active involvement in the process. It also identifies methods for providing timely and appropriate information that responds to residents questions and concerns. The following plan is based on the results of the community interviews described earlier and it addresses the goals and activities of importance to the community.

<b>1) ACTIVITY: Information Repository and Administrative Record</b>	
<i>Objective:</i>	To provide residents with all documents and resources used by EPA/UDEQ in reaching decisions about the site and its cleanup
<i>Method:</i>	An information repository has been established at Eureka City Hall, located at 15 Church St., Eureka, Utah. Two other locations are at the EPA Regional office located at 999 18 <sup>th</sup> St. Suite 300, Denver, Colorado 80202 and at UDEQ, 168 North 1950 West, Salt Lake City, Utah 84116.
<i>Timing:</i>	The administrative record was established and open in August of 2000 at the time of the site investigation. It will remain open until all operating units (OU) and final Record of Decisions (ROD's) are completed. The information repository was established in March of 2001.
<b>2) ACTIVITY: Prepare and distribute fact sheets, reports and technical summaries</b>	
<i>Objective:</i>	To provide residents with current, timely, accurate information about site activities.
<i>Method:</i>	Fact sheets will be mailed to all parties on the mailing list and to residents with mailboxes in the local Eureka post office. Copies will be available at other key locations including the information repository, city hall and EPA Eureka offices. Information will include past, current and upcoming details about site activities as well as Q&A reflecting community concerns.
<i>Timing:</i>	During the summer construction season fact sheets may be monthly, other times of the year distribution will be as needed.
<b>3) ACTIVITY: Public Comment Periods</b>	
<i>Objective:</i>	To give the community an opportunity to review and comment on various EPA/UDEQ documents, in particular proposed plans for cleanup activities. This provides for meaningful involvement in the process and provides EPA/UDEQ with valuable information for use in making decisions.

<i>Method:</i>	Each comment period will be announced by EPA/UDEQ. Public notices will announce the availability of a document, duration of comment period, how and where to submit comments. Notices will be placed in local newspapers and fact sheets including posting at local business establishments.
<i>Timing:</i>	Comment periods will be announced as appropriate. The proposed plan has a requirement for a public comment period of at least 30 days and may be extended if requested for an additional 30 days.
<b>4) ACTIVITY: Public Meetings</b>	
<i>Objective:</i>	To update the community on site developments, address community questions and concerns and to take formal public comment.
<i>Method:</i>	Public meetings will be held at the Tintic High School upon availability or the Eureka Memorial Building. EPA/UDEQ will schedule and present information for the community and provide at least two weeks notice of the scheduled meeting.
<i>Timing:</i>	Both formal and informal public meetings and open houses will be held as needed. To date two public meetings were held in August of 2000 and March of 2001 respectively and one open house held in July of 2001.
<b>5) ACTIVITY: Responsiveness Summaries</b>	
<i>Objective:</i>	To summarize comments received during comment periods, to document how the Agency has considered those comments and to provide responses to major comments.
<i>Method:</i>	The responsiveness summary will be prepared as part of the ROD on an operable unit or cleanup action. Typically, this document contains an overview, background on community involvement and summary of comments and responses.
<i>Timing:</i>	The responsiveness summary will be issued as part of the ROD.
<b>6) ACTIVITY: Technical Assistance Grants</b>	
<i>Objective:</i>	To provide resources for community groups to hire technical advisers who can assist in interpreting technical information and provide expert advice.
<i>Method:</i>	EPA has provided information to both the Eureka City Council and the public at an open house. A public notice has been sent to the local newspapers soliciting interest in a TAG.
<i>Timing:</i>	Ongoing
<b>7) ACTIVITY: Revise Community Involvement Plan</b>	
<i>Objective:</i>	To identify and address community needs, issues or concerns regarding the site cleanup that are not currently addressed in this CIP
<i>Method:</i>	The revised CIP will be based on community interviews and other comments received at public meetings or through letters or phone/email.

<i>Timing:</i>	The CIP will be revised at a minimum of every three years or as needed until the site is closed out and work has been completed.
<b>8) ACTIVITY: Educate and inform lending institutions about the Superfund process</b>	
<i>Objective:</i>	Distribute copies of EPA's policy on homeowner and lenders potential liability during a Superfund cleanup. A cover letter will accompany the fact sheets on liability with an explanation of the situation in Eureka. If requested by a resident, an EPA representative will contact a lender or potential buyer of property to explain our policy.
<i>Method:</i>	To assist the community in real estate transactions to the extent possible by explaining the Superfund process and EPA policy on financial liability for lending institutions.
<i>Timing:</i>	Ongoing
<b>9) ACTIVITY: Media education and outreach</b>	
<i>Objective:</i>	To prevent erroneous or misleading information to be printed about the situation in Eureka.
<i>Method:</i>	Work proactively with the media to ensure balanced and accurate coverage of the work being conducted. Develop productive relationships with the media to encourage trust and responsibility in reporting on EPA/UDEQ's efforts in the area.
<i>Timing:</i>	Ongoing

## Attachment A Contacts

### **U.S. Environmental Protection Agency**

Paula Schmittiel, Remedial Project Manager  
1-800-227-8917 ext. 6861  
[schmittiel.paula@epa.gov](mailto:schmittiel.paula@epa.gov)

Al Lange, On-Scene Coordinator  
1-800-227-8917 ext. 6987  
[lange.al@epa.gov](mailto:lange.al@epa.gov)

Catherine Roberts, Community Involvement Coordinator  
1-800-227-8917 ext. 6025  
[roberts.catherine@epa.gov](mailto:roberts.catherine@epa.gov)

Susan Griffin, Toxicologist  
1-800-227-8917 ext. 6651  
[griffin.susan@epa.gov](mailto:griffin.susan@epa.gov)

### **Utah Department of Environmental Quality**

David Bird, Project Manager  
(801) 536-4219  
[dgbird@deq.state.ut.us](mailto:dgbird@deq.state.ut.us)

Scott Everett, Toxicologist  
(801) 536-4117  
[severett@deq.state.ut.us](mailto:severett@deq.state.ut.us)

Dave Allison, Community Involvement Coordinator  
(801) 536-4479  
[dallison@deq.state.ut.us](mailto:dallison@deq.state.ut.us)

### **Utah Department of Health**

Mark Jones, Lead Program Coordinator  
(801) 538-6191  
[mejones@doh.state.ut.us](mailto:mejones@doh.state.ut.us)

### **Central Utah Public Health Department**

Robert Resendes, Health Officer/Director

70 Westview Drive  
Richfield, Utah 84701  
(435) 896-5451 or (435) 896-5452,  
Fax: (435) 896-4353  
(435) 896-5451

### **Federal Elected Officials**

Office of United States Senator Robert F. Bennett  
4225 Federal Building  
Salt Lake City, UT 84138  
(801) 524-5933

Historic Courthouse Building  
51 South University Avenue, #310  
Provo, Utah 84601  
(801) 379-2525  
Fax: (801) 379-3432

Office of United States Senator Orrin G. Hatch  
51 S. University Ave., Suite 320  
Provo, UT 84606  
(801) 375-7881  
Fax: (801) 374-5005

Office of U.S. Congressman James V. Hansen  
1017 Federal Building  
324 25th Street  
Ogden, UT 84401  
(801) 393-8362

### **Utah State Representatives**

Senator Leonard M. Blackham- District 28  
P.O. Box 337  
Moroni, Utah 84646  
Office: (435) 436-8125  
Home: (435) 436-8489

Representative Darin G Peterson-District 67  
451 East 1250 North  
Nephi, Utah 84648  
Home: (435) 623-2271

### **Juab County Officials**

William Boyd Howarth  
160 North Main  
Nephi, UT 84648  
(435) 623-3407  
Fax: (435) 623-5936

Joseph A. Bernini  
98 North Church Street  
Eureka, UT 84628  
(435) 433-6627  
Fax: (435) 623-5936

Robert Steele  
160 North Main  
Nephi, UT 84648  
(435) 623-3407  
Fax: (435) 623-5936

### **Eureka City Council**

Mayor Lloyd Conder  
Eureka City Hall  
P.O. Box 156  
15 North Church Street  
Eureka, Utah 84628  
(435) 433-6915  
Fax: (435) 433-6891

### **City Council Members**

Marylou Draper  
Jay W. Evans  
Robert D. Pagnani  
Michael Sorenson  
Brian Underwood

Fred Garbett, City Manager  
Patricia Bigler, City Recorder

### **Media**

Salt Lake Tribune  
(801) 257-8525

Deseret News

(801) 237-2121

Provo Daily Herald  
(801) 373-5489

Eureka Reporter  
(435) 433-6933

## Attachment B Repository and List of Documents

### **Repository Locations**

- 1) U.S. EPA  
999 18<sup>th</sup> St. Suite 300  
Denver, Colorado 80202
- 2) UDEQ  
168 North 1950 West  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84416
- 3) Eureka City Hall  
15 N. Church St.  
Eureka, Utah 84628

### **List of Documents**

URS Removal Preliminary Assessment Report

Bureau Of Reclamation Residential XRF Package  
May-December 2000 (one book per month of data)

Eureka Mills Outside Sampling Results  
Appendices C I-IV

Eureka Mills Mine Waste Sampling Results  
Appendices C I-IV

Hazard Ranking Scoring (HRS) Package 1-25

Conceptual Reclamation Plan, July 12, 2001

March 2001 Fact sheet

July 2001 Eureka Mill Questions and Answers



## Attachment C

### Eureka Mills Community Interview Questionnaire

### July 2001

#### **QUESTIONS:**

1. What is your understanding of the Eureka Mills site? When did you first become aware of problems in the area?
2. Do you have any concerns about the work being done in Eureka?
3. What issues or concerns would you like to see EPA or UDEQ address?
4. When you want to know what is going on in Eureka or have questions, whom do you contact?
5. What kinds of information do you want to receive from EPA/UDEQ?
6. What is the best way to get information to the community? For instance local radio station, newspaper, fact sheets?
7. How often would you like to receive information?
8. When you get information, whom do you share it with? Are there people that you trust for advice and information?
9. Who are Eureka's leaders? Juab County leaders?
10. How much do you want to be involved in what EPA/UDEQ does?
11. Are there other people that we should contact?
12. Is there anything else you would like to add?
13. Would you like to review the draft Community Involvement Plan?